Appendix F. Jenkins Creek Water Quality Data (1999-2000)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Jenkins Creek Water Quality Data (1999-2000)

Table F-1. Jenkins Creek Nutrient, Total Suspended Solids and Bacteria Results. (All results over water quality targets for this TMDL are highlighted.)

Date	TSS	Nitrate+N	Total-P	e-coli
4/14/99	98	0.52	0.17	60
4/28/99	144	5.09	0.32	180
5/12/99	173	1.61	0.35	180
5/26/99	268	2.97	0.52	530
6/9/99	188	2	0.28	630
6/24/99	455	2.37	3.93	1100
7/7/99	601	4.12	0.96	750
7/22/99	134	4.49	0.26	4500
8/3/99	722	1.5	1.03	1200
8/18/99	126	1.82	0.38	100
9/1/99	362	2.27	0.58	1200
9/22/99	77	0.27	0.27	850
10/6/99	42	0.16	0.025	260
10/21/99	6	4.99	0.13	40
11/16/99	2	6.74	0.05	<10
12/8/99	1	8.2	<0.05	<10
1/11/00	2	4.89	0.08	<10
2/9/00	40	1.26	0.13	10
3/15/00	54	1.42	0.19	80

Weiser Flats
Year 2

Date	TSS	Nitrate+N	Total-P	e-coli
4/5/00	4	0.26	<0.05	80
4/19/00	78	1.1	0.2	300
5/4/00	138	1.42	0.29	260
5/17/00	287	2.12	0.39	820
6/1/00	190	3.2	0.36	640
6/15/00	203	0.87	0.32	3800
6/26/00	157	2.43	0.29	1000
7/13/00	434	6.56	0.7	200
7/27/00	360	1.74	0.85	3700
8/8/00	76	2.29	0.36	2600
8/23/00	140	4.11	0.36	>8300
9/7/00	52	0.7	0.24	170
9/21/00	9	7.82	0.18	270
10/4/00	19	<0.02	0.14	130

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix G. Distribution List

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table G-1. List of Individuals and Entities that Received Copies of the Draft Weiser Flat Subbasin Assessment and TMDLs for Review and Comment as Part of the Public Process.

Name	Affiliation	Location
Adams County Commissioners	Adams County	Council, ID
ASWCD	Agricultural Interests	Council, ID
Crane Creek Reservoir	Weiser River WAG/TAG	Weiser, ID
Flood Control District #3Lost	Weiser River WAG/TAG	Cambridge, ID
Valley Reservoir Company	Irrigators	Fruitvale, ID
Water Master	Irrigators	Midvale, ID
Weiser River SCD	Agricultural Interests	Weiser, ID
Dale Allen	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	McCall, ID
Gary Bahr	Idaho Department of Agriculture	Boise, ID
Judy Bartlett	Common Sense Solutions	Midvale, ID
Jeff Batten	PHD3	Weiser, ID
Jack Biddle	Holladay Engineering	Payette, ID
Bosco Bossler	Concerned Citizen	Midvale, ID
LeVelle Braun	Grazing and Livestock	Weiser, ID
Ron Brooks	Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts	Payette, ID
Candace Brown	Weiser WAG	Cambridge, ID
Scott Brown	Idaho Conservation Commission	Boise, ID
Kirk Campbell	Idaho Department of Agriculture	Boise, ID
Mike Campbell	Cambridge City Council	Cambridge, ID
Art Correia	Weiser River WAG	Weiser, ID
Ferrel Crossley	Ada Soil and Water Conservation District	Council, ID
John Field	Concerned Citizen	Weiser, ID
Jerome Grandi	Concerned Citizen	Weiser, ID
Wendell Greenwald	Concerned Citizen	Walla Walla, WA
Scott Grunder	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	Nampa, ID
Ron Hasselstrom	Waste Water Treatment Plant	Council, ID
Jon Haupt	Bureau of Land Management	Boise, ID
Calvin Hickey	Agriculture/Row Crops	Weiser, ID
Mike Holladay	Holladay Engineering	Payette, ID
Harmon Horton	Weiser River Soil Conservation District	Midvale, ID
Mike Ingham	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality	Boise, ID
Gordon Keetch	University of Idaho	Council, ID
Scott Koberg	Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts	Caldwell, ID
Greg Lesch	US Forest Service	Weiser, ID
Marlene Lively	City of Council	Council, ID
Vern Lolley	Weiser River WAG	Weiser, ID
Herb Malany	Forestry Interests	Emmett, ID
Russ Manwaring	West Central Highlands RC&D	Emmett, ID
Roy Mink	Washington County Commissioner	Cambridge, ID
Russell Mink	Weiser River Soil Conservation District	Cambridge, ID
Ralph Myers	Idaho Power Company	Boise, ID
Paul Nichols	Concerned Citizen	Fruitvale, ID
Deb Parliman	US Geological Survey	Boise, ID
Joe Qualls	Weiser River WAG	Weiser, ID
Steve Reddy	Washington County Extension	Weiser, ID
Rob Ruth	Signal American News	Weiser, ID
Royce Schwenkfelder	Idaho Cattle Association	Cambridge, ID
Esther Smith	Concerned Citizen	Weiser, ID

Name	Affiliation	Location
Jeri Soulier	Concerned Citizen	Weiser, ID
Allen Tarter	Bureau of Land Management	Boise, ID
Diana Thomas	Washington County Commissioner	Weiser, ID
Kenneth Uhrig	Public at Large	Weiser, ID
Gail VanTassell	Concerned Citizen	Weiser, ID
John Westra	Idaho Department of Water Resources	Boise, ID
Jerry Williams	US Fish and Wildlife Service	Boise, ID
Dave Zimmer	US Bureau of Reclamation	Boise, ID

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Brownlee Reservoir (Weiser Flat) Total Maximum Daily Load

Comment and Response Matrix

April 15, 2003 through May 30, 2003 Public Comment Period

No public comments were received during the formal public comment period. The comments in the following matrix were received from Idaho Department of Agriculture and the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts immediately prior to the public comment period, and from USEPA during the public comment period.

Prepared by:
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Boise Regional Office

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

No.	From	Comment	Response
1	K. Campbell (ISDA)	Table B-1 on page xx - note that the 576 E coli value is for secondary contact.	Changes have been made as suggested.
2	K. Campbell (ISDA)	Suggested that average total phosphorus, sediment and other pertinent values be reviewed for accuracy.	Values have been reviewed as suggested.
3	K. Campbell (ISDA)	Page 64 last paragraph, instead of Hog Creek replace with Jenkins Creek.	Changes have been made as suggested.
4	K. Campbell (ISDA)	Suggestion to check TSS calculation mechanism for consistency throughout TMDL document	Values and calculation mechanisms have been reviewed as suggested.
5	K. Campbell (ISDA)	Remove ISDA from the list of agencies that conducted monitoring on Dennett Creek in Table C-1.	Changes have been made as suggested.
6	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Editorial comments**	Changes have been made as suggested.
7	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Page xx:** Paragraph 4, second sentence includes *"...for bacteria and had elevated levels of sediment and nutrients."* **Suggestion:** Clarify *"elevated levels"*	An explanation has been added.
8	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Suggestion:** In the pollutant discussions for each creek, include the data averages for each pollutant measured, not just those for sediment.	Changes have been made as suggested.
9	S. Koberg (IASCD)	Include discussion of proposed de-listing for sediment on Hog Creek. Table E For Hog Creek, sediment should be included as a de-list	Not proposing delisting because no duration data is available at this time.
10	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Page xxix:** Paragraph 5, beginning "In the event that …" **Comment:** This sentence seems unduly harsh given the discussion in the following paragraph regarding BMP modification. While the process exists for potential regulatory authority, it does not seem necessary to mention the "stick" approach here. Maybe eliminate this sentence and focus on the "carrots".	Additional text has been added before the language in question to better acknowledge the demonstrated willingness on the part of the local agricultural/ranching community to implement BMPs and protect water quality.
11	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Page 2: Paragraph** 2, eighth sentence reads *"TMDLs are not required for a water body impaired by pollution, but not specific pollutants."* Needs clarification	An explanation has been added.
12	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Page 77: Paragraph** 4, last sentence reads *"Nutrient management plans are recommended for these operations."* **Suggestion:** Change to *"Nutrient management plans are required by ISDA for feedlots by July 2005."*	Change has been made as suggested.

No.	From	Comment	Response
13	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Page 97:** Table 5.8 **Suggestion:** Currently there is no Table 5.8; include one for proposed bacteria reduction in accordance with proposed listing in next cycle	Reductions required within the bacteria TMDLs will be identified in the bacteria TMDL process. Insufficient information exists at this time to accurately identify the reductions to meet water quality criteria.
14	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Page 100: Idaho** Soil Conservation Commission is not included in the representative list. **Suggestion:** Include Idaho Soil Conservation Commission in the list.	Change has been made as suggested.
15	S. Koberg (IASCD)	**Page 101: Paragraph** 2, second sentence reads *"Adequate implementation requires that enough reduction measures be installed and that they be properly maintained."* **Suggestion:** Clarify "enough reduction measures", i.e. "enough to achieve the load reduction goals"	Clarification has been added.
16	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	Section 5.1 Monitoring Points. It is unclear in the document for each of the streams where the 'upstream' sites are located. Please reference a map or provide a description in the text or a table as to where these monitoring points are located.	Monitoring points have been identified in the map in Figures 1.5 through 1.9 and are referenced in the text.
17	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	Section 5.1. It would be helpful to mention here that the data sources are described in Appendix C and that copies of the data are on file at the DEQ offices. The data used in the analyses should be available and retrievable for review in the future.	Change has been made as suggested.
18	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	**Section 5.3** This section as well as Table 5.4 also refer to the 'upstream' monitoring sites being used for determination of the natural/background loads. Per above, please provide a reference to these locations.	Monitoring points have been identified in the map in Figures 1.5 through 1.9 and are referenced in the text.
19	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	**Section 5.4** Margin of Safety. The second and third paragraphs are confusing in their discussions. The second paragraph mentions that the MOS was incorporated into the targets and no further MOS was added to the load allocations. However, the third paragraph mentions that an additional explicit MOS was added into the load allocations. Please clarify.	Text has been added to clarify this point.
20	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	**Section 5.4** Seasonal Variation. A statement should be included that; 'Therefore, seasonal variation and critical conditions were considered in development of the TMDLs.'	Change has been made as suggested.

No.	From	Comment	Response
21	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	**Section 5.4** Reasonable Assurances. For clarity it should be stated that, 'since no point sources are present within the subbasin, reasonable assurances are not required. However, a discussion on nonpoint source reductions has been provided.'	Change has been made as suggested.
22	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	Table 5.6. The derivation of 'Reductions Required' is unclear. In subtracting the load allocations from the 'Current Loads' presented in Table 5.4, with the exception of Hog Creek, none of the resulting reductions agree. If a current load other than those presented in Table 5.4 were used, please explain. For clarity, the 'current load', or whatever number used, should be presented in the table and the method for determining the reductions (the equation) should be explained in the text or table. If a margin of safety was added, it would be helpful to show that also.	Appropriate tables have been revised to clarify the concern identified.
23	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	Table 5.6. For Jenkins Creek, the 'Natural plus Background' numbers do not agree between Table 5.4 and 5.6, (0.14 vs. 0.10 lbs/day).	Error has been corrected.
24	M. Fillipini (USEPA)	Table 5.7. As with Table 5.6, the calculations in Table 5.7 also do not agree with the 'Current Loads' given in Table 5.5. In addition, none of the 'Natural plus Background' numbers agree with Table 5.5. Please explain or correct.	Appropriate tables have been revised to clarify the concern identified.
25	L. Woodruff (USEPA)	Page 90, last paragraph. The statement is made that septic system loads are minimal, therefore not incorporated into the allocations. It would be better to state that '...the fraction of the total load is minimal, and it has been included with the other sources in the nonpoint source allocation.' This way the load, though minimal, is officially accounted for in the allocations.	Change has been made as suggested.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK